



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,401	02/12/2002	Robert E. McCoy	P79-4	7032
7590 06/10/2011				
PHILIP M. WEISS, ESQ. WEISS & WEISS 300 Old Country Road Suite 251 Mineola, NY 11501			EXAMINER FILIPCZYK, MARCIN R	
			ART UNIT 2158	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/10/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/074,401

**Applicant(s)**

MCCOY, ROBERT E.

**Examiner**

MARC FILIPCZYK

**Art Unit**

2158

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

This action is responsive to Applicant's amendment filed on April 7, 2011.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-10 are pending.

To expedite the process of examination Examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. amendments, 35 U.S.C. 112, objections and the like) set forth by the Examiner that Applicants provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

***Priority***

Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60/268,140 filed on February 12, 2001.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334).

Regarding claim 10, Matsumoto discloses a method for determining which non-internet advertisements direct which web clicks to a website comprising: (abstract)

advertising by an internet company through use of television, radio and or newspaper ads; (see fig. 1, items 15 and 201 and col. 6, lines 45-65 and col. 7, lines 15-45: *mail magazine*)

providing information concerning where said ads are being run demographically and date and time adds are run to a database of a system; (col. 7, lines 4-45, also see col. 6, lines 45-65)

storing information regarding said ads in said database; (see fig. 1, items 15 and 201 and col. 6, lines 45-65 and col. 7, lines 15-45)

storing times of day a person logs onto a site along with location of person logging onto said site using an IP address; (fig. 2, item 62, col. 8, lines 53-64)

subtracting from said system from said stored internet information internet traffic from links from other websites and not from direct logins to said website; (col. 8, lines 53-63, col. 9, lines 46-65 and col. 10, line 8 to col. 11, line 37),

comparing timing and location of advertising to timing and location of when a user logs onto said internet site; (col. 8, lines 53-63, col. 9, lines 46-65 and col. 10, line 8 to col. 11, line 37) and,

determining which source of advertising caused a user to log on to said internet site by comparing timing and location of advertising to timing and location when a user logs onto said internet site (fig. 9, col. 9, lines 61-65 and col. 10, lines 31-61 see Advertisers ABC and DEF in fig. 9, also see col. 8, lines 47-65, user timing and location for access to entrance page).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Matsumoto et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,334) in view of Goldberg et al (USPN. 7,496,943).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Matsumoto discloses a system and method for determining  
which non-internet ads direct which web clicks to a web site comprising (abstract):

a database comprising information about a user's non-internet media buys which includes  
advertising on television, radio and newspaper ads (see fig. 1, items 15 and 201 and col. 6, lines  
45-65 and col. 7, lines 15-45; *mail magazine*);

(*Note: mailing magazine is one example of non-internet media buys*)

an index log file optionally comprising a user's IP address and data and time user logs  
onto said web site (fig. 2, item 62, col. 8, lines 53-64);

said system comparing information from said first database with information from said  
index log file to determine which of said non-internet ads generated said web clicks and  
providing said information to a user (col. 10, lines 8-12);

and wherein the user's non internet buys comprises:

date and time of advertising, type of advertising, location of ad and expiration date of the  
ad (col. 7, lines 4-45, also see col. 6, lines 45-65).

Matsumoto does not expressly teach a second database for storing user's IP address, but  
does store user's referrer log showing all referring pages from which the user is led to entrance  
page and also optionally stores the user's IP address in the index log file (62). Note, the user's

IP address does not have to be stored because Matsumoto system uses an index URL embedded in the ad which allows for the monitoring of the user's access induced by the advertisement hence the actions of the user are known without the need for user's IP address, however, optionally user's IP address may be stored (col. 8, lines 53-63).

However, Goldberg teaches an advertising system wherein two databases are used to store relevant information about advertisements and information about user affected by the advertisement (see figures 3 and 6, col. 24, line 56 to col. 24, line 22, Goldberg).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store user's IP address and referrer log in a second database in the Matsumoto system as taught by Goldberg by modifying the index log file (62) to be implemented as a database. One would have been motivated to use a second database instead of an index log file to easier manipulate the data stored in the index log file and organize the information about advertisements and user activity.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Matsumoto/Goldberg disclose the system further comprises a report that shows which ads generated the web clicks (fig. 9, col. 9, lines 61-65 and col. 10, lines 31-61 see Advertisers ABC and DEF, Matsumoto).

Regarding claim 4, Matsumoto/Goldberg disclose the information about a user's media buys further comprises demographics of the ad (col. 6, lines 59-63, Matsumoto).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, Matsumoto/Goldberg disclose the information about a user's media buys further comprises cost of the ad (col. 5, lines 22-29, Matsumoto).

Regarding claim 6, Matsumoto/Goldberg disclose a report that shows which of the web clicks do not correspond to an ad (col. 9, line 61 to col. 10, line 20, Matsumoto).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants arguments filed April 7, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See discussion below:

Applicant argues that because Matsumoto uses an index URL the actions of the user are known without the need for the user's IP address.

Matsumoto may use user's IP address (col. 8, lines 55-65) for tracking user activity data.

Applicant argues that there is no reason to combine Matsumoto and Goldberg.

Examiner disagrees. Goldberg teaches an advertising system wherein two databases are used to store relevant information about advertisements and information about user affected by the advertisement (see figures 3 and 6, col. 24, line 56 to col. 24, line 22, Goldberg).

The rejection states "It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store user's IP address and referrer log in a second database in the Matsumoto system as taught by Goldberg by modifying the index log file (62) to be implemented as a database. One would have been motivated to use a second database instead of

an index log file to easier manipulate the data stored in the index log file and organize the information about advertisements and user activity". It should be apparent from the cited passage of the rejection that Matsumoto and Goldberg combined teach all the pending claims and Goldberg is one of many prior art's available which teaches an advertising system and storing information in two different databases, respectively.

Previous arguments and responses of interest:

Applicant previously argued that Matsumoto does not teach which non-internet ads generated the web clicks.

Examiner disagrees. Regarding claims 2 and 8, Matsumoto discloses the system further comprises a report that shows which ads generated the web clicks (fig. 9, col. 9, lines 61-65 and col. 10, lines 31-61 see Advertisers ABC and DEF in fig. 9 and related text).

In regard prior correspondence in reference to claims 4-6, note that it appears that Applicants agree with the rejections on record, see pages 8 and 9 of the 3/13/08 response.

No other arguments have been raised, hence with respect to all the pending claims 1, 2 and 4-10, Examiner respectfully traverses Applicants assertion based on the discussion and rejection cited above.



***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARC FILIPCZYK whose telephone number is (571)272-4019. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ali can be reached on 571-272-4105. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MF  
June 7, 2011  
/Marc R Filipczyk/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2158